REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the final Office Action mailed February 6, 2007. In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that claims 1-22 are pending and rejected. By this response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 10.

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following discussion, Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated or obvious under the respective provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103. Thus, Applicants believe that all of the claims are now in allowable form.

It is to be understood that Applicants, by amending the claims, do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the prior art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant response including amendments.

Amendments to the Claims

By this response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 10. The amendments to the claims are fully supported by the Application as originally filed. For example, the amendments to claims 1 and 10 are supported at least by the Applicants' specification on page 13, lines 24-26.

Thus, no new matter has been added and the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendments.

Objection to Claim 18

Claim 18 is objected to because, on line 1, "ready" should be changed to –reading--. Claim 18 has been corrected and, therefore, the objection should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9-16, 18-20, and 22

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 9-16, 18-20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,600,573 to Hendricks (Hendricks).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants' claim 1 recites:

> 1. A method for formatting and coding content for storage and delivery, comprising:
> providing at least two different formats for content storage;
> receiving a coding and formatting request;
> analyzing parameters contained in the coding and formatting request;
> configuring a formatting codec in one of at least two different formats for content delivery using the analyzed parameters;
> decoding, formatting, and coding target content using the configured formatting codec, whereby coded target output content is produced; and
> routing the coded target output content to one or more target addresses. (Emphasis added).

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. Hendricks fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, as arranged in claim 1.

Specifically, Hendricks fails to teach or suggest at least providing at least two different formats for content storage **and** configuring a formatting codec in one of at least two different formats for content delivery using the analyzed parameters, as recited in claim 1. The Applicants' invention teaches that the aggregator may be configured to store content in one or more specific formats that will balance the highest quality of programming content to be delivered to the users versus available storage space. (See Applicants' specification, p. 13, ll. 9-11). The decoder and content formatter reformats incoming content into the required formats and coding schemes for local storage in the aggregator. (See *Id.* at ll. 16-21). Moreover, the format and coding scheme for delivery may be different from that used for local storage in order to accommodate particular parameters of a user's download request. (See *Id.* at ll. 24-26.)

Hendricks discloses an operations center with video storage for a television program packaging and delivery system. Hendricks does not teach or suggest providing at least two different formats for content storage **and** configuring a formatting

codec in one of at least two different formats for content delivery using the analyzed parameters.

Thus, Hendricks does not teach or suggest each and every one of the limitations of Applicants' invention as recited in claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Hendricks and is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102. Independent claim 10 recites relevant limitations similar to those recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons discussed above, independent claim 10 also is not anticipated by Hendricks and is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102. Furthermore, claims 2-7, 9, 11-16, 18-20, and 22 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 10, while adding additional elements. Therefore, these dependent claims also are not anticipated by Hendricks and are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102 for at least the same reasons discussed above in regards to independent claims 1 and 10.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of Claims 8, 17, and 21

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 17, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks in view of U.S. Patent 4,797,918, issued on January 10, 1989, hereinafter "Lee" and U.S. Patent 4,450,481, issued on May 22, 1984, hereinafter "Dickinson". Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

This ground of rejection applies only to dependent claims and is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 given Hendricks. Since the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 given Hendricks has been overcome, as described hereinabove, this ground of rejection cannot be maintained. Accordingly, claims 8, 17, and 21 are non-obvious and patentable over Hendricks under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn.

THE SECONDARY REFERENCES

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 0 2 2007

that the secondary references are no more pertinent to Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the Office Action. Therefore, Applicants believe that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this Office Action.

CONCLUSION

Thus, Applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application, are anticipated or obvious under the respective provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102 and 103. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall or Chin (Jimmy) Kim, at (732) 530-9404, so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/2/07

Chin B. Kim
Registration No. 54,220
Attorney for Applicant(s)

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808